Thermal light cannot be represented as a statistical mixture of pulses

Aurélia Chenu,[1] Agata M. Brańczyk,[1,2] Gregory D. Scholes,[1,3] and J. E. Sipe[4]

[1]*Department of Chemistry, Centre for Quantum Information and Quantum Control, 80 St George Street, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, M5S 3H6 Canada**

[2]*Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 2Y5, Canada*

[3]*Department of Chemistry, Princeton University, Washington Rd, Princeton, New Jersey 08544, U.S.A.*

[4]*Department of Physics, 60 St George Street, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, M5R 3C3 Canada*

We ask whether or not thermal light can be represented as a mixture of single broadband coherent pulses. We find that it *cannot*. Such a mixture of pulses is simply not rich enough to mimic thermal light; indeed, it cannot even reproduce the first-order correlation function. We show that it is possible to construct a modified mixture of single coherent pulses that *does* yield the correct first-order correlation function at equal space points. However, as we then demonstrate, such a mixture cannot reproduce the second-order correlation function.

PACS numbers: 44.40.+a, 42.50.Ar, 42.50.-p

arXiv:1409.1926v2 [quant-ph] 28 Nov 2014

Absorption of light by molecules can initiate fundamental photo-induced processes including photochemical reactions, photocatalysis, and solar energy conversion. While the characterization of steady-state processes such as the quantum yield can be obtained using incoherent light, the resolution of photo-initiated dynamics requires the use of short (e.g. tens of femtosecond duration) laser pulses to populate and probe excited-state populations [1, 2]. Such techniques play a central role in establishing the timescales and mechanisms of fundamental processes, such as the underlying functions of photosynthetic light-harvesting complexes [3, 4]. The use of these techniques raises the question of whether or not the ultrafast pulses employed – which are significantly different from natural thermal light – lead to behaviour specific to those ultrafast pulses. In particular, some researchers have recently questioned whether dynamics initiated by sunlight excitation might be different from those detected in femtosecond laser experiments performed on light-harvesting complexes [5–10]. This has opened a debate on how photo-excitation by natural light should be understood. For example, can sunlight be viewed as "a series of random ultrashort spikes with a duration as short as the bandwidth allows" [4]?

Light from the sun indeed has an ultra-short coherence time of approximately 1.3 fs [11]; it has a spectrum close to that of black body radiation at approximately 5777 K [12], characterized by thermal photon-number statistics [13]. In this paper we ask whether or not thermal light can be understood as a mixture of single broadband coherent pulses.

We find that it cannot. The first clue is given by an intuitive picture considering a particular class of pulses. For a widely used class of pulses, defined by a well-defined (linear) phase relationship between the modes, the density matrix of a mixture of such pulses cannot represent thermal equilibrium. Any mixture of these pulses would exhibit off-diagonal elements in the density matrix when written in a spectral-Fock basis, whereas the density matrix representing thermal equilibrium is diagonal. This 'plausibility' argument is given in the Supplemental Material.

More generally, while the state of thermal light in a volume Ω is represented by a density operator $\rho^{\rm th}$ with unit trace, we demonstrate that *no* unit-trace density operator $\rho^{\rm mix}$ consisting of a mixture of pulses can equal $\rho^{\rm th}$. Such a mixture of pulses cannot even give the correct result for the first-order correlation function in the $\Omega \to \infty$ limit.

Nonetheless, it is possible to construct a mixture $\rho^{\rm imp}$ that *does* yield a first-order correlation function at equal space points that matches that of thermal light. This has apparently not been demonstrated yet; we do it here. However, if the amplitudes of the pulses remain finite at $\Omega \to \infty$ the mixture must be *trace-improper*, in that $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho^{\rm imp})$ is of order Ω and diverges as $\Omega \to \infty$. And whether we consider a large but finite volume Ω, or a trace-improper mixture of physical pulses as $\Omega \to \infty$, we find that it is impossible for a mixture of pulses to reproduce even the simplest second-order correlation function of thermal light.

We begin by introducing the notation used to characterize our pulses. To build the pulses it is useful to quantize the electromagnetic field in an infinite volume, with annihilation (creation) operators $a_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ ($a^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$), where the wave vector $\mathbf{k}$ ranges continuously and the helicity λ is positive or negative; these operators satisfy the commutation relations $\left[a_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}, a^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}'\lambda'}\right] = \delta(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')\delta_{\lambda\lambda'}$. A pulse is characterized by its nominal position $\mathbf{r}_{\rm o}$, a (complex) amplitude $\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_{\rm o}s}$, a spectral distribution $f_{\mathbf{r}_{\rm o}s;\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ – normalized so that $\sum_\lambda \int d\mathbf{k}\ \left|f_{\mathbf{r}_{\rm o}s;\mathbf{k}\lambda}\right|^2 = 1$, with $d\mathbf{k} = dk_x dk_y dk_z$ – and other parameters (including those necessary to specify the polarization and the direction of propagation) that we label collectively by s. From the spectral distribution

we construct a creation operator

$$a^\dagger_{\mathbf{r}_o s} = \sum_\lambda \int d\mathbf{k}\; f_{\mathbf{r}_o s;\mathbf{k}\lambda} a^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}\lambda},$$

with $\left[a_{\mathbf{r}_o s}, a^\dagger_{\mathbf{r}_o s}\right] = 1$, and the pulse is described by the quantum state

$$|\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} f_{\mathbf{r}_o s}\rangle \equiv e^{\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} a^\dagger_{\mathbf{r}_o s} - \alpha^*_{\mathbf{r}_o s} a_{\mathbf{r}_o s}} |vac\rangle\,,$$

where $|vac\rangle$ is the vacuum state and $\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s}$ is a complex number; it is easy to confirm that $\langle \alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} f_{\mathbf{r}_o s} | \alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} f_{\mathbf{r}_o s}\rangle = 1$. For the positive frequency part of the (Heisenberg) electric field operator,

$$\mathbf{E}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r},t) = i\sum_\lambda \int d\mathbf{k}\, \sqrt{\frac{\hbar\omega_k}{16\pi^3\epsilon_0}}\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} e^{-i\omega_k t} a_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}, \quad (1)$$

where $\omega_k = c\,|\mathbf{k}|$, the $\mathbf{e}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ are the polarization vectors (see Supplemental Material), and as usual ϵ_0 is the permittivity of free space, we have the classical expectation value

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\mathbf{r}_o s)}(\mathbf{r},t) \equiv \langle \alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} f_{\mathbf{r}_o s} | \mathbf{E}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r},t) | \alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} f_{\mathbf{r}_o s}\rangle$$

given by (1) with the operator $a_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ replaced by the complex number $\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} f_{\mathbf{r}_o s;\mathbf{k}\lambda}$. The state $|\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} f_{\mathbf{r}_o s}\rangle$ is "coherent" in the sense that it factorizes correlation functions according to $G^{(n)(\mathbf{r}_o s)}(\mathbf{r}_1 t_1 \ldots \mathbf{r}_n t_n; \mathbf{r}_{n+1} t_{n+1} \ldots \mathbf{r}_{2n} t_{2n}) = \prod_j \left(\mathcal{E}^{(\mathbf{r}_o s)}(\mathbf{r}_j, t_j)\right)^* \mathcal{E}^{(\mathbf{r}_o s)}(\mathbf{r}_{j+n}, t_{j+n})$ for all orders of n, as defined by Glauber [14]; here we use the superscript $(\mathbf{r}_o s)$ on G to identify the state $|\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} f_{\mathbf{r}_o s}\rangle$, which is the quantum description of what might be called a "classical" pulse [14]. In particular, for such a state we have

$$\begin{aligned} &G^{(1)(\mathbf{r}_o s)}_{ij}(\mathbf{r}_1 t_1; \mathbf{r}_2 t_2) \\ &\quad\equiv \langle \alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} f_{\mathbf{r}_o s} | E^{(-)}_i(\mathbf{r}_1,t_1) E^{(+)}_j(\mathbf{r}_2,t_2) | \alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} f_{\mathbf{r}_o s}\rangle \\ &\quad= \left(\mathcal{E}^{(\mathbf{r}_o s)}_i(\mathbf{r}_1,t_1)\right)^* \left(\mathcal{E}^{(\mathbf{r}_o s)}_j(\mathbf{r}_2,t_2)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where subscripts on field labels indicate Cartesian components, e.g. $\mathbf{E}^{(+)}_j(\mathbf{r},t) = \mathbf{E}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r},t)\cdot\hat{\mathbf{j}}$.

We consider families of pulses such that for fixed parameters s the pulses only differ by their nominal positions $\mathbf{r}_o$. For such families of pulses we have

$$f_{\mathbf{r}_o s;\mathbf{k}\lambda} = K(s,\mathbf{k}\lambda)\, e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}_o}, \quad (2)$$

and the associated $\mathcal{E}^{(\mathbf{r}_o s)}(\mathbf{r},t)$ depends on $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{r}_o$ only through its dependence on $(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}_o)$; we will give particular examples of $K(s,\mathbf{k}\lambda)$ below, but for the moment we keep the function very general. Nonetheless, we do assume that each member of the family is well localized in space at some initial time, in that $G^{(1)(\mathbf{r}_o s)}_{ij}(\mathbf{r}0;\mathbf{r}0) \to 0$ as $|\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}_o| \to \infty$, and that the integral of $G^{(1)(\mathbf{r}_o s)}_{ij}(\mathbf{r}0;\mathbf{r}0)$ over all space is finite. Then for fixed $\mathbf{r}$ the integral over all $\mathbf{r}_o$ of $G^{(1)(\mathbf{r}_o s)}_{ij}(\mathbf{r}0;\mathbf{r}0)$ will also be finite. It will be convenient below to work with a volume Ω centered at the origin, and we define

$$\mu_i(\mathbf{r},s,\Omega) \equiv \int_\Omega G^{(1)(\mathbf{r}_o s)}_{ii}(\mathbf{r}0;\mathbf{r}0)\; d\mathbf{r}_o \quad (3)$$

(no sum over i on the right-hand side). Since each $G^{(1)(\mathbf{r}_o s)}_{ii}(\mathbf{r}0;\mathbf{r}0)$ is real and positive, $\mu_i(\mathbf{r},s,\Omega)$ will be finite and positive for all $\mathbf{r}$ and Ω, increasing as Ω increases and with a well-defined limit $\mu_i(\mathbf{r},s,\infty)$; here and except when explicitly mentioned otherwise we assume the amplitudes $\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s}$ and parameters s used to characterize the pulses are held fixed and independent of Ω.

Now for thermal light filling all space the standard analysis (see, e.g. Mandel and Wolf [13]) yields the result [11]

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(1)\mathrm{th}}_{ij}(\mathbf{r}t;\mathbf{r}(t+\tau)) &= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho^{\mathrm{th}} E^{(-)}_i(\mathbf{r},t) E^{(+)}_j(\mathbf{r},t+\tau)\right) \\ &= \delta_{ij}\int_0^\infty \frac{\hbar c k^3}{6\pi^2\epsilon_0}\frac{e^{-ick\tau}}{e^{\beta\hbar ck}-1}dk, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

for the first-order correlation function at equal space points. To attempt to describe thermal light by a mixture of pulses over a volume of observation Ω, we would write

$$\rho^{\mathrm{mix}} = \int ds \int_\Omega d\mathbf{r}_o \frac{\mathfrak{p}(s)}{\Omega} |\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} f_{\mathbf{r}_o s}\rangle \langle \alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s} f_{\mathbf{r}_o s}|\,, \quad (5)$$

where pulses are included with equal density about each central position $\mathbf{r}_o$ in the volume, and $\mathfrak{p}(s) \geq 0$ with

$$\int ds\; \mathfrak{p}(s) = 1, \quad (6)$$

where here and in (5) the variables constituting s are to be integrated or summed over as required; the condition (6) guarantees that $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho^{\mathrm{mix}}) = 1$. Near the edge of the volume Ω we would not expect (5) to give a correct representation of thermal equilibrium, but we would demand that it does so near the origin.

We now prove that we cannot choose the pulses so that $\rho^{\mathrm{mix}} = \rho^{\mathrm{th}}$ as $\Omega \to \infty$. For we have

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(1)\mathrm{mix}}_{ii}(\mathbf{0}0;\mathbf{0}0) &= \mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho^{\mathrm{mix}} E^{(-)}_i(\mathbf{0},0) E^{(+)}_i(\mathbf{0},0)\right) \\ &= \int ds \int_\Omega d\mathbf{r}_o \frac{\mathfrak{p}(s)}{\Omega} G^{(1)(\mathbf{r}_o s)}_{ii}(\mathbf{0}0;\mathbf{0}0) \\ &= \frac{1}{\Omega}\int ds\; \mathfrak{p}(s)\mu_i(\mathbf{0},s,\Omega)\,; \end{aligned}$$

(no sum over i). Since $G^{(1)\mathrm{mix}}_{ii}(\mathbf{0}0;\mathbf{0}0)$ is clearly finite for any Ω, the integral of $\mathfrak{p}(s)\mu_i(\mathbf{0},s,\Omega)$ over s must be finite for any Ω. As $\mathfrak{p}(s)\mu_i(\mathbf{0},s,\Omega) > 0$ for

all s and is an increasing function of Ω with a well-defined limit $\mathfrak{p}(s)\mu_i(\mathbf{0},s,\infty)$ as $\Omega \to \infty$, we see that $G_{ii}^{(1)\mathrm{mix}}(\mathbf{0}0;\mathbf{0}0) \to 0$ as $\Omega \to \infty$. But from (4) it is clear that $G_{ii}^{(1)\mathrm{th}}(\mathbf{0}0;\mathbf{0}0) \neq 0$. Thus we cannot represent thermal equilibrium by a unit-trace density operator describing a mixture of pulses. Such a mixture is simply not rich enough to describe thermal light.

The proof would fail if we allowed the amplitudes of the pulses to change as Ω changed. In fact, we will see below that we *can* mimic the first-order correlation function of thermal light at equal-space points by that of unit-trace mixture of pulses if we allow the square of the amplitudes of the pulses to scale as Ω. While such a scaling could be entertained for finite Ω, it would be physical nonsense as $\Omega \to \infty$ because the pulses would acquire infinite energy. If we return to our assumption of fixed amplitudes and properties regardless of Ω, the scaling of $G_{ij}^{(1)\mathrm{mix}}(\mathbf{0}0;\mathbf{0}0)$ as $1/\Omega$ suggests a different strategy, i.e., the consideration of *trace-improper* density operators, of the form

$$\rho^{\mathrm{imp}} = \int ds \int_\Omega d\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}\, \bar{p}(s)\, |\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s} f_{\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s}\rangle \langle \alpha_{\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s} f_{\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s}| \qquad (7)$$

where $\bar{p}(s) \geq 0$ and

$$\int ds\, \bar{p}(s) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{V}},$$

where $\mathcal{V}$ is a constant with units of a volume $[\Omega]$. The probability distribution $\bar{p}$ has units of $[\Omega^{-1}V_s^{-1}]$, where V_s is the volume of the integration space of the parameters s. Importantly, $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho^{\mathrm{imp}}) = \Omega/\mathcal{V}$ scales as Ω, and so certainly $\rho^{\mathrm{imp}} \neq \rho^{\mathrm{th}}$, since $\mathrm{Tr}(\rho^{\mathrm{th}}) = 1$, independent of the volume. Yet one might hope that the trace-improper mixture could lead to a correct representation of *some* of the properties of thermal light, if $\bar{p}(s)$ and the spectral functions $f_{\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s}$ and amplitudes $\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s}$ are chosen correctly. We next show that this is possible for the first-order correlation functions. Here it is convenient to let the volume $\Omega \to \infty$ in (7) at the start. Then we wish to show that with a correct choice of $\bar{p}(s)$, $f_{\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s}$, and $\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s}$ we can find

$$G_{ij}^{(1)\mathrm{imp}}(\mathbf{r}t;\mathbf{r}(t+\tau)) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\left(\rho^{\mathrm{imp}} E_i^{(-)}(\mathbf{r},t) E_j^{(+)}(\mathbf{r},t+\tau)\right)$$
$$= \int ds \int d\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}\, \bar{p}(s) \quad \left(\mathcal{E}_i^{(\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s)}(\mathbf{r},t)\right)^* \mathcal{E}_j^{(\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s)}(\mathbf{r},t+\tau),$$

where the integral of $\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}$ now ranges over all space, such that

$$G_{ij}^{(1)\mathrm{imp}}(\mathbf{r}t;\mathbf{r}(t+\tau)) = G_{ij}^{(1)\mathrm{th}}(\mathbf{r}t;\mathbf{r}(t+\tau)), \qquad (8)$$

which we refer to as the "simulation condition" we wish ρ^{imp} to satisfy.

To choose a ρ^{imp} that fulfills this, we specify the set of parameters s that can be used to characterize our pulses. In our first example we take s to include a central wave vector $\mathbf{k}_\mathrm{o} = k_\mathrm{o}\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ of the pulse, with the unit vector $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ identifying the main polarization direction, and a unit vector $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ that characterizes the polarization as described below; thus $s = \{k_\mathrm{o}, \hat{\mathbf{m}}, \hat{\mathbf{n}}\}$, V_s has units of inverse volume, and $\bar{p}(s)$ is dimensionless. We characterize pulses of this type by

$$K(s,\mathbf{k}\lambda) = \mathcal{N}\, L(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}_\mathrm{o})\, (\mathbf{e}^*_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}) \cdot (\mathbf{k} \times \hat{\mathbf{n}}),$$

(recall Eq. 2) where $\mathcal{N}$ is a normalization constant chosen so the normalization of $f_{\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s;\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ is satisfied, and $L(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}_\mathrm{o})$ is a real function. The expectation value of $\mathbf{E}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r}) \equiv \mathbf{E}^{(+)}(\mathbf{r},0)$ in the state $|\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s} f_{\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s}\rangle$ is given by

$$\mathcal{E}^{(\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s)}(\mathbf{r}) = i\mathcal{N}\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s} \int d\mathbf{k} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar\omega_k}{16\pi^3\epsilon_0}} (\mathbf{k}\times\hat{\mathbf{n}})$$
$$\times\, L(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}_\mathrm{o}) e^{i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{r}-\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o})}\,.$$

This allows the representation of very general forms of pulses in free space; $\mathcal{E}^{(\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s)}(\mathbf{r})$ is of course divergenceless, as it must be to represent a pulse; it will typically be centered at $\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}$, and its polarization is characterized by having *no* component in the $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ direction, $\hat{\mathbf{n}}\cdot\, \mathcal{E}^{(\mathbf{r}_\mathrm{o}s)}(\mathbf{r}) = 0$. In specifying the weight function $\bar{p}(s)$ we assume a uniform distribution over pulse directions $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$; for a given $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ only $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ perpendicular to $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ are chosen, but the distribution over such $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is also uniform. Choosing a fixed direction in the plane perpendicular to $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ for each $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$, and denoting the angle that $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ makes from this direction by Ψ, we have

$$\int ds\, \bar{p}(s) \to \int_0^\infty dk_\mathrm{o}\, p(k_\mathrm{o}) \int d\hat{\mathbf{m}} \int_0^{2\pi} d\Psi,$$

where the remaining dependence $p(k_\mathrm{o})$ is on the magnitude of the central wave vector of the pulse, $k_\mathrm{o} = |\mathbf{k}_\mathrm{o}|$.

For any proposed $L(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}_\mathrm{o})$ our task is then to see if $p(k_\mathrm{o})$ can be chosen so that our simulation condition (8) is guaranteed. We begin by considering pulses of a Gaussian form,

$$L(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}_\mathrm{o}) \;=\; e^{-\frac{|\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}_\mathrm{o}|^2}{2\sigma^2}}, \qquad (9)$$

with the associated required normalization condition $\mathcal{N}$. For thermal radiation at $T = 5777$ K we find that the simulation condition (8) can be guaranteed only if σ is chosen so that the pulse has a bandwidth on the order of THz or smaller, describing pulses that are on the order of picoseconds in length or longer. Details are given in Chenu et al. [16]. Interestingly, no physical solution can be found for femtosecond pulses with a bandwidth as broad as the thermal spectrum. The problem is that the Gaussian shape (9) differs too much from the shape required to guarantee that the norm of the integrand of (4) is reproduced. Thus the only way that we can satisfy (8) is to choose σ so small that, compared with the thermal spectrum, $L(\mathbf{k},\mathbf{k}_\mathrm{o})$ is essentially proportional to a Dirac delta function; then $p(k_\mathrm{o})$ itself is relied on to capture the shape of that integrand.

To satisfy (8) with broadband pulses we can work instead with a set of parameters s that includes only a nominal direction of propagation of the pulse $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$, as well as a polarization vector $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ as before, $s = \{\hat{\mathbf{m}}, \hat{\mathbf{n}}\}$. Note now that V_s is dimensionless whereas $\bar{p}(s)$ has dimension of Ω^{-1}. We take our pulses (2) to be specified by

$$K(s, \mathbf{k}\lambda) = \mathcal{N}\, l(k)\, v(\hat{\mathbf{k}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{m}})\, (\mathbf{e}^*_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}) \cdot (\mathbf{k} \times \hat{\mathbf{n}}), \qquad (10)$$

where the function $v(x)$ is chosen to characterize the spread in the direction of wave vectors in the pulse and should be peaked at $x = 1$ for $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ to indicate the nominal direction of propagation of the pulse; the function $l(k)$ is now relied on to help capture the shape of the norm of the integrand of (4); note that again the pulses are all divergenceless. For our weight function $\bar{p}(s)$ we assume that the $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ are distributed isotropically and, for each $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$, all $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ perpendicular to $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ are equally distributed,

$$\int ds\, \bar{p}(s) \to p \int d\hat{\mathbf{m}} \int_0^{2\pi} d\Psi,$$

where p is now a constant with units of $[\Omega^{-1}]$, $d\hat{\mathbf{m}}$ indicates an integration over solid angle, and Ψ denotes the angle $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ makes from a fixed direction in the plane perpendicular to $\hat{\mathbf{m}}$. We show [16] that such a trace-improper mixture can lead to (8) by choosing

$$l(k) = \frac{1}{k\sqrt{e^{\beta\hbar ck} - 1}} \text{ and } p|\alpha|^2 = \frac{4\zeta(3)}{\pi^4(\beta c\hbar)^3} \qquad (11)$$

where ζ is the Riemann-zeta function; and we also provide a full characterization of such pulses. By comparing (4) and (11), it is clear that the bandwidth of the pulse helps capture that of the thermal radiation.

The requirement of a fixed product $p|\alpha|^2$ illustrates that the need for improper behavior as $\Omega \to \infty$ can be met either by the trace or by the pulses. In the example of a density operator ρ^{imp} we have been considering, any finite p will lead to an infinite trace for $\Omega \to \infty$. Alternately, we could repeat the derivation sketched here insisting on a density operator of unit trace; then we would find that p would vanish as $\Omega \to \infty$, and the condition (11) would demand that $|\alpha|^2$ diverge in that limit. The latter option would only make physical sense for a finite volume of observation Ω; we put it aside for now, but return to it again below.

The preceding two examples show that although a trace-improper mixture of pulses is not described by the same density operator as thermal light, such a mixture can be constructed to reproduce the first-order correlation function of thermal light. As we look at higher-order correlation functions we will necessarily find that such a mixture fails to reproduce the properties of thermal light, since $\rho^{\text{imp}} \neq \rho^{\text{th}}$. But can such a mixture capture the second-order correlation function? This is defined by $G^{(2)}_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4}(\mathbf{r}_1 t_1 \mathbf{r}_2 t_2; \mathbf{r}_3 t_3 \mathbf{r}_4 t_4) = \langle E^{(-)}_{i_1}(\mathbf{r}_1 t_1) E^{(-)}_{i_2}(\mathbf{r}_2 t_2) E^{(+)}_{i_3}(\mathbf{r}_3 t_3) E^{(+)}_{i_4}(\mathbf{r}_4 t_4)\rangle$. Choosing all times identical along with $\mathbf{r}_1 = \mathbf{r}_4$ and $\mathbf{r}_2 = \mathbf{r}_3$, this expression represents two simultaneous absorption events at positions $\mathbf{r}_1$ and $\mathbf{r}_2$ respectively [14]. For thermal light at $T = 5777$ K, the second-order correlation function $G^{(2)\text{th}}_{iiii}(\mathbf{R}t\mathbf{0}t; \mathbf{0}t\mathbf{R}t)$ (no sum over i) is shown in Fig. 1 as a function of the distance $\mathbf{R} \equiv \mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_1$ we imagine separating two broadband detectors; we take the direction of $\mathbf{R}$ to lie along the Cartesian axis i. The full expression is given elsewhere [19]. Importantly, beyond a distance of about 0.4 μm for $T = 5777$ K, the second-order correlation function is independent of both the distance $\mathbf{R}$ and the orientation of that vector with respect to the Cartesian axis i,

$$G^{(2)\text{th}}_{iiii}(\mathbf{R}t\mathbf{0}t; \mathbf{0}t\mathbf{R}t) \underset{R\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} \left(\frac{\pi^2}{90\epsilon_0\beta^4(\hbar c)^3}\right)^2. \qquad (12)$$

Clearly, in the presence of thermal light there is a non-zero probability of simultaneous broadband detection events occurring regardless of the distance between the two detectors.

We have not been able to evaluate the second-order correlation function for ρ^{imp} analytically. However, since each member of our family of pulses is localized in space – i.e. it can essentially be contained entirely within a volume centred at its origin – each individual pulse will not be able to simultaneously excite two detectors if at least one of them is outside this volume. Although our mixture is trace-improper, it is composed of an incoherent mixture of localized pulses (*cf.* Eq. 7). Therefore the total probability should equal the sum of the individual



FIG. 1: Normalized second-order correlation function for thermal light as a function of the distance $\mathbf{R}$, where $\mathbf{R}$ is assumed to lie along the Cartesian axis i. Note that it is non-zero for all values of R. Inset: Schematic depicting two detectors (e.g. atoms with a broad absorption band) within (a) the field of a localized pulse and (b) thermal radiation. As the distance between the two atoms increases, the probability that both absorb a photon from any localized pulse tends to zero.



FIG. 2: Schematics illustrating the richness of thermal light as a tensor product over an infinity of modes. The green "+" indicates an *incoherent* sum; the red "⊗" a direct product. (a) Thermal light is built from a tensor product of mixed states, each composed by a mixture of monochromatic coherent states (represented by continuous waves in the insets) with various amplitudes and phases. (b;c) The trace-improper mixture of pulses with (b) Gaussian or (c) thermal lineshape can only reproduce the first-order correlation function (see details in the text).

realizations, and we expect our argument to apply to the mixture as well. Hence such a mixture can never capture the result (12).

Returning to a finite observation volume Ω and the use of a unit-trace density operator representing a mixture of pulses with $|\alpha_{\mathbf{r}_o s}|^2$ proportional to Ω, from the arguments above we see that such a density operator would have no chance of describing the second-order correlation function properly if the observation volume were significantly larger than the size of the pulses. For if it were, the chance of any pulse in the mixture exciting two detectors at different ends of the observation volume would be negligible. Now at $T = 5777$ K the size of the pulses (10) is about 0.4 μm [16], as might be expected from the characteristic length scale of Fig. 1. Hence even if we employed a unit-trace mixture of pulses with the square of their amplitudes proportional to the observation volume, for observation volumes larger than a few cubic microns such mixtures would necessarily describe the second-order correlation function incorrectly.

In summary, we have shown that no mixture of single coherent pulses can represent thermal radiation. Allowing the mixture to be trace-improper, or allowing the square of the amplitudes of the pulses to scale with the observation volume, we can reproduce the first-order correlation function of thermal light at equal space points. If Gaussian pulses are used, pulses with a surprisingly narrow bandwidth are required. Alternately, broadband pulses with a lineshape mirroring the thermal spectrum can be used. The mixtures are schematically represented in Fig. 2. Nonetheless, these mixtures, and indeed any (proper or improper) mixture of well-localized pulses, fail to reproduce even the second-order correlation function of thermal light. The difficulties suggest that one should look instead for a representation of thermal light as mixture of *sets* of pulses.

These results highlight the very particular properties of thermal light and its fundamental distinction from mixtures of broadband coherent states. Furthermore, it suggests that our intuition of light may be limited to the property of linear interactions, and caution should be applied when making connections between nonlinear optical experiments involving broadband coherent, and those involving multi-mode incoherent light.

We are grateful to P. Brumer, B. Sanders, A. Steinberg and H. Wiseman for interesting and fruitful discussions. We thank I. Kassal, S. Rahimi-Keshari and S. Baghbanzadeh for stressing the possibility of scaling the square of the pulse amplitudes with observation volume. A.C. acknowledges funding from the Swiss National Science Foundation and from the DFAIT of Canada through the Post-Doctoral Research Fellowship awarded by the Government of Canada. This work was supported by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, DARPA (QuBE) and the United States Air Force Office of Scientific Research (FA9550-13-1-0005). Research at Perimeter Institute is supported by the Government of Canada through Industry Canada and by the Province of Ontario through the Ministry of Research and Innovation.

* Corresponding author: aurelia.chenu@utoronto.ca

[1] G. Fleming, *Chemical Applications of Ultrafast Spectroscopy*, *International Series of Monographs on Chemistry* (Oxford University Press, 1986).

[2] A. H. Zewail, "Femtochemistry: Atomic-Scale Dynamics of the Chemical Bond," J. Phys. Chem. A **104**, 5660 (2000).

[3] R. van Grondelle and V. I. Novoderezhkin, "Energy transfer in photosynthesis: experimental insights and quantitative models," Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **8**, 793 (2006).

[4] Y.-C. Cheng and G. R. Fleming, "Dynamics of Light Harvesting in Photosynthesis," Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **60**, 241 (2009).

[5] X.-P. Jiang and P. Brumer, "Creation and dynamics of molecular states prepared with coherent vs partially coherent pulsed light," J. Chem. Phys. **94**, 5833 (1991).

[6] T. Mančal and L. Valkunas, "Exciton dynamics in photosynthetic complexes: excitation by coherent and incoherent light," New Journal of Physics **12**, 065044 (2010).

[7] K. Hoki and P. Brumer, "Excitation of biomolecules by coherent vs. incoherent light: Model rhodopsin photoisomerization," in *Procedia Chemistry*, **3**, 122 (2011).

[8] F. Fassioli, A. Olaya-Castro, and G. D. Scholes, "Coherent energy transfer under incoherent light conditions," J. Phys. Chem. Lett. **3**, 3136 (2012).

[9] P. Brumer and M. Shapiro, "Molecular response in one-photon absorption via natural thermal light vs. pulsed laser excitation," Proc. Nat. Am. Soc. **109**, 19575 (2012).

[10] I. Kassal, J. Yuen-Zhou, and S. Rahimi-Keshari, "Does Coherence Enhance Transport in Photosynthesis?," J. Phys. Chem. L. **4**, 362 (2013).

[11] Y. Kano and E. Wolf, "Temporal coherence of black body radiation," Proc. Phys. Soc. **80**, 1273 (1962).

[12] M. Iqbal, *An Introduction to Solar Radiation* (Academic Press, 1983).

[13] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical coherence and quantum Optics* (Cambridge university press, 1995), Chap. 13.

[14] R. J. Glauber, "Coherent and incoherent states of the radiation field," Phys. Rev. **131**, 2766 (1963).

[15] R. Loudon, *The Quantum Theory of Light*, 3rd ed. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2000), Chap. 1.

[16] A. Chenu, A. M. Brańczyk, and J. E. Sipe, "First-order decomposition of thermal light in terms of a statistical mixture of pulses," *in preparation.*

[17] D. G. Bradley and G. H. C. New, "Ultrashort pulse measurement," in *IEEE*, **72**, 313 (1974).

[18] C. L. Mehta and E. Wolf, "Coherence Properties of Blackbody Radiation. II. Correlation tensors of the quantized field," Phys. Rev. **134**, 1149 (1964).

[19] A. M. Brańczyk, A. Chenu, and J. E. Sipe, "Second-order correlation function of thermal light," *in preparation.*

Supplemental Material

A statistical mixture of pulses has coherences between photon-number states

We first introduce the formalism used to characterize broadband states of light and their statistical mixtures over a finite normalization volume V. We build a state of light from the creation (annihilation) operator $A^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ ($A_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$) where the wave vector $\mathbf{k}$ takes discrete values imposed by boundary conditions on the volume V, and λ is the helicity. The operators fulfill the commutation relation $[A_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}, A^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}'\lambda'}] = \delta_{\mathbf{k}\mathbf{k}'}\delta_{\lambda\lambda'}$. Each state of light is characterized by a set of parameters collectively labeled by the subscript σ. From the spectral distribution F_σ – normalized such that $\sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} |F_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}\lambda}|^2 = 1$ – we construct a generalized creation operator defined as

$$A^\dagger_\sigma = \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} F_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}\lambda} A^\dagger_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\,,$$

with $\left[A_\sigma, A^\dagger_\sigma\right] = 1$. A generalized coherent state of light is then described by

$$|\alpha_\sigma F_\sigma\rangle \equiv e^{\alpha_\sigma A^\dagger_\sigma - \alpha^*_\sigma A_\sigma}\,|vac\rangle\,, \tag{13}$$

where $|vac\rangle$ is the vacuum state, and it is easy to confirm that $\langle\alpha_\sigma F_\sigma|\alpha_\sigma F_\sigma\rangle = 1$. Beyond the normalization condition, the spectral distribution F_σ could in principle be completely general.

We create a statistical mixture of states $|\alpha_\sigma F_\sigma\rangle$ summing over states with different parameters σ:

$$\rho^{\text{dis}} = \sum_\sigma p_\sigma |\alpha_\sigma F_\sigma\rangle\langle\alpha_\sigma F_\sigma|, \tag{14}$$

with the probability distribution p_σ fulfilling $\sum_\sigma p_\sigma = 1$. The label "dis" refers to the fact that the wave vector $\mathbf{k}$ only takes discrete values here. The states can be expanded in the spectral-Fock basis $|\mathbf{n}\rangle = \prod_{\otimes\mathbf{k}\lambda} |n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\rangle_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ in which the elements of the density matrix for our mixture read:

$$\rho^{\text{dis}}_{\mathbf{nm}} = \sum_\sigma B_{\mathbf{nm};\sigma} e^{i\sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\phi_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}\lambda}\,(n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda})}, \tag{15}$$

where

$$B_{\mathbf{nm};\sigma} = p_\sigma\, e^{-|\alpha_\sigma|^2} \prod_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \frac{|\alpha_\sigma F_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}\lambda}|^{n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}+m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}}}{\sqrt{n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}!\, m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}!}} \tag{16}$$

is a positive real number, and $\phi_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}\lambda} \equiv \arg(\alpha_\sigma F_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}\lambda})$.

Given a state σ, if the phases $\phi_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}_1\lambda_1}$ and $\phi_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}_2\lambda_2}$ of two different modes are independent from one another and uniformly distributed over the wave vector $\mathbf{k}$, then the exponential in (15) will be non-zero iff $n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} = 0$ for each $\mathbf{k}$. In other words, the only non-zero terms in the density matrix will be those fulfilling $n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} = m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ for each mode, resulting in a diagonal density matrix in the spectral-Fock basis. However, such states will not correspond to localized pulses.

A state that corresponds to a localized pulse (within the normalization volume) can be constructed by imposing a phase relation between the different modes. This is true in particular for a widely-used class of pulses for which the phase of different modes has a linear relationship of the form $\phi_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}\lambda} = a_\sigma + \mathbf{b}_\sigma \cdot \mathbf{k}$, where a_σ is a real constant and $\mathbf{b}_\sigma$ is a vector (see e.g., Bradley and New [17]); two pulses differing only by their values of a_σ and $\mathbf{b}_\sigma$ are identical, except for different phase factors and different locations of their centres.

We interpret a sum over all possible pulses as a sum over all possible combinations of all possible amplitudes and phases. We therefore make the substitution $\sum_\sigma \to \sum_{|\alpha_\sigma|}\sum_{|F_\sigma|}\sum_{\phi_\sigma}$. Similarly, for a linear phase relationship, we interpret a sum over all possible linear phases as a sum over all possible combinations of all possible constants a and b, and therefore make the substitution $\sum_{\phi_\sigma} \to \sum_{a_\sigma}\sum_{b_\sigma}$. The density matrix element can now be written as:

$$\rho^{\text{dis}}_{\mathbf{nm}} = \sum_{|\alpha_\sigma|}\sum_{|F_\sigma|} B_{\mathbf{nm};|\alpha_\sigma||F_\sigma|} \sum_{a_\sigma} e^{ia_\sigma \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda})} \sum_{b_\sigma} e^{i\mathbf{b}_\sigma \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\mathbf{k}\,(n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda})}. \tag{17}$$

For a uniform distribution of a_σ and $\mathbf{b}_\sigma$, the sum over σ will be non-zero only for $\sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}) = 0$ and $\sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\mathbf{k}\,(n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}) = 0$. This will certainly restrict the elements $\rho^{\text{dis}}_{\mathbf{nm}}$ that can be nonzero, but it is hardly enough to

impose "mode incoherence," which we define to be the condition $\rho^{\rm dis}_{\mathbf{nm}}$ vanishes unless $n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} = m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ individually for all $\mathbf{k}$ and all λ. This mode incoherence is a necessary condition for the density matrix to represent thermal light. The situation is not significantly improved if we move beyond a linear phase relation. Any *finite* expansion of $\phi_{\sigma,\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ to order q in $\mathbf{k}$ will impose more restrictions (of the form $\sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \mathbf{k}^q \, (n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}) = 0$) that characterize the non-vanishing elements of $\rho^{\rm dis}_{\mathbf{nm}}$, but this set is far from the set of restrictions necessary to specify mode incoherence. Hence the density matrix characterizing the kind of mixture we have considered here can always be expected to have coherences between photon number states, and thus not represent thermal light.

Simple example with three modes

The previous argument can be illustrated by a concrete example. For this purpose, consider the basis states $|\mathbf{N}\rangle \equiv |n_1\rangle_{\mathbf{k}_1\lambda_1}|n_2\rangle_{\mathbf{k}_2\lambda_2}|n_3\rangle_{\mathbf{k}_3\lambda_3} \prod_{\otimes(\mathbf{k}\lambda)\neq\{(\mathbf{k}_1\lambda_1),(\mathbf{k}_2\lambda_2),(\mathbf{k}_3\lambda_3)\}} |0\rangle_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ and $|\mathbf{M}\rangle \equiv |m_1\rangle_{\mathbf{k}_1\lambda_1}|m_2\rangle_{\mathbf{k}_2\lambda_2}|m_3\rangle_{\mathbf{k}_3\lambda_3} \prod_{\otimes(\mathbf{k}\lambda)\neq\{(\mathbf{k}_1\lambda_1),(\mathbf{k}_2\lambda_2),(\mathbf{k}_3\lambda_3)\}} |0\rangle_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$. We specifically choose $m_1 = n_1 - 1$, $m_2 = n_2 + 2$ and $m_3 = n_3 - 1$ for reasons that will become clear below. With no restriction on possible phases, the off-diagonal element $\langle\mathbf{N}|\rho|\mathbf{M}\rangle$ reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{\rm dis}_{\mathbf{NM}} &= \sum_\sigma B_{\mathbf{NM};\sigma} \, e^{i \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \phi_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}\lambda} \, (n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda})} \\ &= \sum_\sigma B_{\mathbf{NM};\sigma} \, e^{i(\phi_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}_1\lambda} - 2\phi_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}_2\lambda} + \phi_{\sigma;\mathbf{k}_3\lambda})}. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

We now impose a linear restriction on the phase, and choose the three occupied modes such that $\mathbf{k}_1 - 2\mathbf{k}_2 + \mathbf{k}_3 = 0$ and $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3$. We note that the specific choice of $|\mathbf{N}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{M}\rangle$ above fulfills the conditions $\sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}) = 0$ and $\sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \mathbf{k}(n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}) = 0$. The off-diagonal element now reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{\rm dis}_{\mathbf{NM}} &= \sum_\sigma B_{\mathbf{NM};\sigma} \, e^{i a_\sigma \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} (n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda})} \, e^{i \mathbf{b}_\sigma \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \mathbf{k} \, (n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} - m_{\mathbf{k}\lambda})} \\ &= \sum_\sigma B_{\mathbf{NM};\sigma} \, . \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The above expression is a sum of real positive numbers and is therefore non-zero. As a result, all off-diagonal elements of the form $\langle (n_1)_{\mathbf{k}_1\lambda_1} (n_2)_{2\mathbf{k}_1\lambda_1} (n_3)_{3\mathbf{k}_1\lambda_1}| \, \rho \, |(n_1 - 1)_{\mathbf{k}_1\lambda_1} (n_2 + 2)_{2\mathbf{k}_1\lambda_1} (n_3 - 1)_{3\mathbf{k}_1\lambda_1}\rangle$ will be non-zero, demonstrating that incoherent mixtures of pulses with a linear phase relation lead to density matrices with coherences between the number-states of different modes.